

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS PO. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignina 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/899,261	07/06/2001	Yasuhiro Yoshioka	0649-0789P-SP	3458	
2292	7590 05/28/2003				
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHU	RCH, VA 22040-0747		CHEA,	CHEA, THORL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1752		
			DATE MAILED: 05/29/2003)	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/899,261	YOSHIOKA, YASUI	HIRO				
y	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Thorl Chea	1752					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 12 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) Ithey raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: none.							
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).							
10. Other:							
		Thorl Chea Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1752					

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 009/899,261

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the limitation of the n value from 0 and 1 to "1" change the scope of the claimed invention, and therefore, it would require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejection set forth in the final office action paragraphs 6-9 in view of the English translation of the foreingn priority document and T.D. filed May 12, 2003.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons set forth in the final office action. The specification disclosure fails to provide the statement whether the reusults presented therein would have been unexpected by the worker of ordinary skill in the art. The statement such as "(i)t can be seen that by using the fluorine-based surface active agents used in the invention, the occurrence of white spots can be remarkably reduced" is insufficient to overcome the prima facie case of obviousness. The results should be unexpected by the worker of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. The samples prepared in the specification disclosure is related to the aqueous coating composition containing SBR latex in combination with the fluorine surfactant. The specification fails to show whether the combination of the fluorine surfactant and with toning system containing phthalazine compound and phthalic acid compound improve the properties of the photothermographic material which would have been found unexpected by the worker of ordinary skill in the art. See also the Examiner's position with respect to the reults in the specification disclosure in the final office action. The surfactants taught in the prior art of record contains functional group similar to that of the present claimed invention, and the worker of ordinary skill in the art would have expected that it would perform similarly in the absence of showing otherwise.